



CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS CITY COUNCIL AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
MEETING OF: APRIL 15, 2002

THESE PROCEEDINGS ARE BEING PRESENTED LIVE ON KCLV, CABLE CHANNEL 2, AND ARE CLOSED CAPTIONED FOR OUR HEARING IMPAIRED VIEWERS. THE COUNCIL MEETING, AS WELL AS ALL OTHER KCLV PROGRAMMING, CAN BE VIEWED AT www.kclv.tv. THE PROCEEDINGS WILL BE REBROADCAST ON KCLV CHANNEL 2 AND THE WEB ON TUESDAY AT 8:00 PM, FRIDAY AT 12:00 NOON, THE FOLLOWING TUESDAY AT 8:00 PM AND FRIDAY AT 12:00 NOON.

- CALL TO ORDER
- ANNOUNCEMENT RE: COMPLIANCE WITH OPEN MEETING LAW
- PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

MINUTES:

PRESENT: MAYOR GOODMAN and COUNCIL MEMBERS REESE, M. McDONALD (excused at 11:49 a.m.), BROWN, L.B. McDONALD, WEEKLY, and MACK

Also Present: CITY MANAGER VIRGINIA VALENTINE, DEPUTY CITY MANAGER STEVE HOUCHENS, DEPUTY CITY MANAGER DOUG SELBY, DEPUTY CITY MANAGER BETSY FRETWELL, CITY ATTORNEY BRAD JERBIC, and CITY CLERK BARBARA JO RONEMUS

ANNOUNCEMENT MADE – Meeting noticed and posted at the following locations:

Las Vegas Library, 833 Las Vegas Boulevard North
Senior Citizens Center, 450 E. Bonanza Road
Clark County Government Center, 500 S. Grand Central Parkway
Court Clerk's Bulletin Board, City Hall
City Hall Plaza, Posting Board

(8:39)

1-1

MAYOR GOODMAN led the audience in the Pledge.

(8:39)

1-18

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE

SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS CITY COUNCIL AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

MEETING OF: APRIL 15, 2002

DEPARTMENT: FINANCE AND BUSINESS SERVICES

DIRECTOR: MARK R. VINCENT

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

Fiscal Impact

☒

No Impact

Amount:

☐

Budget Funds Available

Dept./Division: Budget & Finance Division

☐

Augmentation Required

Funding Source:

PURPOSE/BACKGROUND:

Review and discussion of FY2003 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget as filed with the Nevada Department of Taxation on April 12, 2002.

RECOMMENDATION:

No Action Required

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

FY2003 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

1. Submitted at meeting: PowerPoint of Budget Workshop
2. Submitted at meeting: Detailed schedule of fully funded projects and those in need of funding
3. Submitted at meeting: List of City of Las Vegas parks in progress
4. Submitted at meeting: Capital Appropriation Calculation schedule
5. Submitted at meeting: Summary page of new and revised cost estimates
6. Submitted at meeting: Capital Project Fund spreadsheet
7. Submitted after the meeting: Capital Project Fund spreadsheet showing allocated funds in red for those projects to be funded Fiscal Year 2003, \$1 next to those projects that would be funded in future years, and NP for new projects.

MINUTES:

CITY MANAGER VIRGINIA VALENTINE indicated that the budget represents the City's financial plan for the coming year. The City's General Fund budget is \$366 million with the largest portion of that being dedicated to public safety, which is about \$200 million. To the extent possible this budget has been developed consistent with the City's vision and mission with consideration of the seven strategic policies adopted by the Council earlier this year. She outlined those seven strategies as: aggressively attract diverse business to the City regardless of

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF APRIL 15, 2002

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

MINUTES – Continued:

geography; develop and support neighborhood integrity and livability; resolve escalating cost of running a City versus revenue capacity; maintain master planning approach as growth happens; revitalize and invigorate mature areas; strengthen the dialogue between the City and its citizens, and development of recreational and leisure opportunities of an intergenerational nature. MS. VALENTINE introduced DEPUTY CITY MANAGER STEVE HOUCHENS, who provided the budget overview, followed by a presentation of the budget by MARK VINCENT, Director, Finance and Business Services and CANDY FALDER, Budget Manager.

MR. HOUCHENS advised that the 2002-2003 Budget is the reflection of difficult economic times. It is strict, conservative and it is representative of local and state governments in this State and across the nation as communities struggle to deal with the aftermath of September 11 and more locally of escalating utility rates, medical insurance coverage, environmental issues and California gaming. However, the City's building permit activity is still relatively strong and new development is being seen in both the city center and suburbs. Some leading indicators show that the community is recovering at an impressive rate. However, those same indicators show that Las Vegas is not completely back to normal. MR. HOUCHENS gave an overview of the Las Vegas resorts occupancy rates after September 11. The most recent fact sheet of the Southern Nevada Index of Leading Economic Indicators, which is published by the University of Nevada Las Vegas Center for Business and Economic Research reflected seven of ten categories that were still negative compared to last year. Those specifically include reducing permits issued and valuation permitted on both residential and commercial development, reduced passenger volume at McCarran Airport, reduced taxable sales and reduced gross gaming revenues. In fact, the lagging recovery of the last two items has led the Governor to declare a projected budget deficit in the tens of millions of dollars if there is no relief, and the City is not immune. The City's greatest revenue source is sales tax and the potential shortfall has resulted in a ten million dollar deficit in this budget proposal that is before the Council today.

MR. HOUCHENS credited the City Council for enhancing the fiscal integrity of the City. The Council's efforts have resulted in two bond-rating increases in less than five years and helped to obtain the passage of the Fire Safety Initiative enabling the City to deal with huge public safety needs. The Council's support has allowed the placement of public private partnerships and of innovative cost cutting and revenue enhancing efforts, such as the City's bed rental program and the medical transport efforts. This Council has supported the enforcement of budget policies that provide a strong financial footing in both good times and bad. Some of those policies include the development of a budget based on historical trending, adjusted for current events. The Council

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF APRIL 15, 2002

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

MINUTES – Continued:

has encouraged business practices using technology, outsourcing and performance measures. Vacant positions are now evaluated and re-justified and savings from vacancies will be used to fund one time costs or replenish reserves. The City established a self imposed property tax limit of 11.2-cent between the City and State, which has been in place for several years now. Revenue projections will be based on conservative growth estimations, and revenue opportunities will be optimized, thus lessening the burden on the taxpayer. The City's ending fund balance should be sufficient to cover from one to two months of operating costs. Finally, the City will strive to maintain reserves for replacement and expansion of its existing infrastructure. In spite of these efforts and policies the City is faced with an uncertain future. Over 56% of the City's budget is dedicated to public safety, which has received 363 new positions over the last three years. Public Works and Field Operations combined received 35 positions. Leisure Services has three positions less than three years ago. City Attorney, City Auditor, City Manager's Office, Finance, and Planning and Development received 30 new positions over the three-year span. More than 85% of all new positions funded during these last three years were for public safety and most were funded by a property tax override. Without the Fire Safety initiative or the Metropolitan Police Ballot Measure of 1996 local government would be hard pressed to fund public safety needs in the communities. However, even with these initiatives, both Metro and the fire department fall short on their goal.

The message for the future is not optimistic and it is clear that limited resources will be taxed to provide enough revenue to even stabilize today's ratio in these public safety areas.

MR. HOUCHENS stated that the City is fortunate to have the Regional Transportation Commission, which has a separate and dedicated tax and authority, which recently presented a billion dollar revenue package in order to continue to build transportation corridors and infrastructure in and around the Valley. The City of Las Vegas and other Nevada cities have no dedicated revenue source for capital improvement. He indicated that there are needs for Public Works facilities, such as those in the west yards. There is a need for new and replacement of fire stations, future office space to handle development services functions, as well as support staff. To save resources the City has also refrained from building a new City Hall in favor of expanding its existing campus. All of these improvements, as well as all the parks and leisure facilities are paid for from non-recurring discretionary revenue sources, which is money saved from operations and vacant positions.

It is estimated that as much as six million dollars in additional funds has been generated from the

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF APRIL 15, 2002

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

MINUTES – Continued:

self-imposed hiring freeze over a year ago. In conclusion, MR. HOUCHENS stated that the hope is that the City's economy and the revenue engines that run it will return back to normal soon. However, the City is not budgeting on that premise, but rather that it may not reach what was known as normal. He reiterated that September 11th was the most precipitous event, but other events are going to have a long-term burden on this City, whether it be air quality, electric power, California gaming, the fallout from Enron or any other host of issues facing local government these days. Now that the City of Las Vegas is getting close to becoming one of the elite 30, a city of half million residents, it is faced with the ongoing problems of being a major city needing to fund metropolitan services.

MR. HOUCHENS introduced MR. VINCENT and MS. FALDER, who gave a PowerPoint presentation with an overview of the City's 2003 Budget. MS. FALDER explained the information slides and MR. VINCENT expanded on the operating budget. The General Fund Budget was started with approximately 10 million dollars and went through a process with the City Manager's Office and with City departments to bring that into alignment. With respect to the Capital Budget, all the needs and projects submitted cannot be funded.

MAYOR GOODMAN verified with MR. VINCENT that the eight million dollars of funds held in trust are for employee insurance programs, workers compensation, and donations.

MR. VINCENT pointed out that proprietary funds are where customer's pay for those services the City provides. In some cases these funds should have been set up with some kind of an operating capital to get them started. An example is the Municipal Golf Fund with a \$650,000 start for year 2003. He mentioned that a good portion of the Capital Appropriations funding is carried over funding for capital projects that would take more than one year to complete. Projects are always in process. He further clarified that these projects are funded in partnership with the Regional Flood Control District (RFC) and Regional Transportation (RTC). In the case of the East Las Vegas Senior Community Center, the debt service on that project is being paid with Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) money. The fire stations are being paid by the Fire Safety Initiative tax.

MS. FALDER clarified for MAYOR GOODMAN that traffic safety includes traffic engineering related to the traffic lights system. MR. VINCENT emphasized that 55% of the budget is going towards public safety. MR. VINCENT indicated that this budget contemplates some operating cost increase relative to the bed rental program, but the revenue from that program far exceeds the City's operating cost. Those revenues are used for one-time projects and not retained in the general fund for ongoing operations.

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF APRIL 15, 2002

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

MINUTES – Continued:

Regarding the new Regional Justice Center, MR. VINCENT stated that this budget includes approximately \$816,000 out of the general fund to bring the City's share of the original commitment of 32.1 million dollars up to what was committed. COUNCILWOMAN McDONALD opined that the City negotiated its percentages in good faith and has done everything according to what was laid out in the 1994 and 1995 agreement and that no additional money should be given. MAYOR GOODMAN concurred and added that the City is entitled to what was originally agreed. MR. VINCENT added that Municipal Court is looking at outsourcing the Public Defender Program. If that is successful, it will generate additional savings for the courts. MAYOR GOODMAN indicated that the letter just went out and verified with JAMES CARMANY, Court Administrator, that the decision will probably be made within three months and the program will be initiated at that time.

MR. VINCENT pointed out that the City evaluated and re-justified vacant positions. As part of the City's Fiscal Year 2003 planning, those vacant positions were looked at and 27 were identified as being vacant for nine months or longer. With that knowledge and with the help of the City Manager's Office, the departments were asked if these positions are still needed or if they could be eliminated and the savings used to fund some of the new positions being requested for FY03. Through that effort, 19 of those positions were eliminated generating a cost saving in excess of a million dollars.

MR. VINCENT indicated that the City lost 5% revenue of the consolidated tax. One of the City's initiatives several years ago was to try to diversify some of the revenue sources, such as the bed rental program and EMS transport. The City has been successful in generating additional revenue, but to a large extent the growth and the consolidated tax revenues are not there and it is not expected to be there for the next year.

MAYOR GOODMAN asked whether the City has a special officer or special department dedicated exclusively to the collection of payments on the City's emergency transportation. MR. VINCENT replied that the treasury division works very closely with the fire department and the billing company in the collection process. In fact, the City is in the process of looking at potentially putting out an RFP for that service in the near future. DEPUTY FIRE CHIEF JEFF MORGAN stated that the EMS division of the fire department has two people who focus on the paperwork that goes through the treasurer's office. The department is still relying on paper reports from the field. However, the collection issue is being addressed both with personnel efforts, as well as a computerized format that would give direct download to the company that does the billing. MR. VINCENT indicated that there is a budget item in the City's capital plan

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF APRIL 15, 2002

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

MINUTES – Continued:

for the “pen base system”, which speeds up the collection of data. The biggest factor is getting the bills out quickly and the pen base system will help that. MAYOR GOODMAN opined that if handled properly this could be a good revenue source. MR. VINCENT stated that the City is trying to balance how aggressive they should get. These are emergency services and oftentimes they are dealing with people who do not have insurance, who are indigent and the City cannot collect. Therefore, the collection percentage compared to some other type of service the City might provide is much lower. But the collection percentage is pretty comparable with the industry currently.

MS. FALDER indicated that 3% of the Capital Projects revenue from the Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority (LVCVA) is used to fund parks by policy. MR. VINCENT emphasized that Capital Projects revenue combined are approximately 10 to 12% of the revenue stream for capital projects. Most of the revenue for capital projects is for the larger regional projects. Very little revenue is generated specifically for City facility projects. That is why it is important to allocate some of the general fund revenues, either from an augmentation process or as part of the City’s yearly budget, because without that it would be impossible to meet the needs of the City.

MS. FALDER explained for MAYOR GOODMAN that the growth in property tax collections is driven by the increase in assessed values. MR. VINCENT expanded on the Property Tax Rate slide and indicated the comparison between the statutory limit that the State sets for the City and the actual rate the City Council levied.

MR. VINCENT pointed out that the Citizens Priority Advisory Committee reviewed this budget presentation and recommended that the City increase its budget policy from 10% to 12%. From an operational standpoint, this budget does not have any specific impact. It has been helpful with outside agencies, like bond raters. In fact, the City has had two bond rating increases within the last four years.

As part of this budget, fee and revenue reviews were conducted. There was a fee increase last year for Building and Safety. Leisure Services is in the process of being evaluated. A fee analysis will be done for the Sanitation fund as well. These evaluations would probably result in a recommendation of some modest, but constant increases in the future.

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF APRIL 15, 2002

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

MINUTES – Continued:

MR. VINCENT indicated that items that were left funded in the tentative budget include monies for nominal drainage. These are projects that are not covered by the Regional Flood Control funding and the City needs to maintain these projects from time to time. The tentative budget also has fire station requests, costs relative to the medical support, and costs for traffic and projects for detention. A variety of facilities are in need of repairs and refurbishments and these facilities have been funded in the tentative budget. They total exactly a million and a half. Included is the City's general fund share of the relocation of the Downtown Area Command. The estimated cost of the engineering and construction would be about 4.2 million dollars, with a HUD EDI grant of \$750,000. That would mean that the General Fund would have to kick three and a half million dollars to make that project whole. Two and a half million dollars was put in the building reserve allocated for projects on the drawing board, and continued expansions of administrative offices. Finally, funded in the tentative budget was Traffic Engineering and Field Operations satellite office in the west service center. That leaves \$14 million available for projects that the Council can appropriate. In addition, allocated in the tentative budget are new revenues that are anticipated for Fiscal Year 2003. If those revenue sources are added for Fiscal Year 2003, that would give the City \$24 million that the Council can appropriate as they wish. This new process would allow for staff to get Council's direction for the final budget submission.

MR. VINCENT presented and submitted a detailed schedule of projects that have been identified on the priority list, broken into two groups, projects that are fully funded and projects in need of funding.

COUNCILMAN MACK indicated that the City Council decided not to move forward with the replacement of the bathhouse at Brinley Pool. He understands that \$300,000 was allocated at the last budget. MR. VINCENT noted that \$100,000 has been carried over in this budget for any demolition or cleanup at the Brinley Pool site if needed. The other \$200,000 has been moved to Heers Park project as per Council's previous direction. COUNCILMAN MACK verified that if the funds allocated for the Heers Park project is not used they would be allocated to the priority list. MR. VINCENT added that as per policy approved by the Council, funds remaining after a project is closed revert back to the CIP reserve balance, which can carry over and be reallocated in future years. On occasion, specific appropriations have been made by the City Council.

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF APRIL 15, 2002

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

MINUTES – Continued:

MR. VINCENT pointed out that one of the items on the fully funded list, Arbor Hills East Park was funded for \$1,200,000 and no input was received to move forward. If that project is eliminated, that money could be added to the twenty-four million dollars. COUNCILMAN REESE stated that the park was to be used with property donated by the State and there are questions whether a park could be built underneath the freeway. Therefore, he suggested that funding from the Arbor Hills Park could be allocated to the Various Existing Park/Rec Facility Upgrades, and when the property for the park is obtained, this money could be refunded for Arbor Hills Park.

Fire Services submitted a request for three stations to be rebuilt and refurbished and other miscellaneous requests totaling over 16 million dollars. However, that request could not be funded because there was insufficient fire safety tax revenue. Therefore, it was pushed to Fiscal Year 2004, but MR. VINCENT emphasized that it is not anticipated that Fiscal Year 2004 will provide sufficient revenue for all those projects. Those stations have not been included on the projects in need of funding, but they could be if the Council so chooses. He is aware that at least one fire station is in dire need of replacement. COUNCILMAN REESE asked for additional information on those stations in need of replacement, starting with the ones that need the most replacement down to the least. DEPUTY CITY MANAGER DOUG SELBY explained that three stations are very old. One is located on Hinson, one on Upland and one near the fire-training center.

MAYOR GOODMAN asked MR. VINCENT what impact the sale of the downtown community center would have if it were sold. MR. VINCENT replied that those improvements already approved by the City Council would need to be made before the center could be marketable.

COUNCILMAN BROWN indicated that although the spreadsheet is informative, it would help to know what is being revised and what is created as new. MR. VINCENT answered that as they received CIP submissions those estimates have been adjusted. CITY MANAGER VALENTINE indicated that it also includes the Council's approved updates when money was shifted on the CIP at the 12/19/2001 City Council meeting.

MR. VINCENT presented a spreadsheet with projects in need of funding with the amount of funding available. The objective is to allocate those monies to parks projects that meet the statutory requirement of a neighborhood park less than 25 acres.

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF APRIL 15, 2002

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

MINUTES – Continued:

As per COUNCILMAN REESE'S request, MR. VINCENT clarified for the public that in the previous allocation from last June, residential construction tax for fiscal 2002 was over allocated for the current year. What little residential construction tax was generated was used to make up for the deficit generated by overestimating how much was believed to be available. There is little new residential construction going on in Ward 3 and that is why there is no generation of tax revenue there.

MR. VINCENT continued outlining the spreadsheet and indicated that the City Council was briefed on the process that allocates CDBG monies for capital projects. That process, controlled by the federal schedule, does not fall within the City's budget process. Therefore, an asterisk was placed as a reminder that while there is no CDBG money to allocate at this time, it is something that the Council might want to consider when it comes time for that process.

JOHN McNELLIS, Deputy Director, Public Works, explained for MAYOR GOODMAN that Harmony Park is the first of a series of parks that could be created along the US 95 corridor. This is a piece of NDOT remnant right-of-way located at the southwest corner of Decatur Boulevard and the freeway. Homes along this corridor were purchased by NDOT for the highway expansion. Discussions are still being held on whether NDOT will pay for this park. COUNCILMAN McDONALD pointed out that the City could take over the maintenance, but would prefer NDOT build the parks. MR. McNELLIS opined that it would be desirable if NDOT would maintain it as well.

COUNCILMAN WEEKLY referred to the Post Office Park and asked whether it is eligible for CDBG funding. CITY MANAGER VALENTINE replied that there is no guarantee that the Post Office would qualify for CDBG funds and that they are allocated through an entirely separate process. COUNCILMAN WEEKLY commented that he appreciates coming up with innovative ways of providing these types of services to the constituents, but cautioned how building of parks are discussed utilizing CDBG funds. Everything that goes on in Ward 5 does not have to be through CDBG funding.

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF APRIL 15, 2002

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

MINUTES – Continued:

COUNCILMAN BROWN requested that each item on the fully funded projects list be discussed. MR. VINCENT reiterated that Arbor Hills East Park was previously prioritized through \$700,000 of residential construction tax money from Ward 3 and the \$500,000 came from appropriations. MR. McNELLIS added that staff is trying to work with the property owner who currently leases the space from NDOT, but the City is not yet at a point where it could go forward with a park idea. The City Council could look at alternate sites. COUNCILMAN REESE pointed out that this is the only location where vacant property is available for the park. Should other vacant properties be made available in the same area, he would certainly look at it. COUNCILMAN WEEKLY expressed concern about the possibility of having a park on one side and a storage facility on the other side, which his constituents totally oppose. MR. McNELLIS answered that he is not sure, but the owner currently has that lease with NDOT on a long-term basis. However, the City can certainly work with NDOT.

COUNCILMAN MACK suggested that the City Council and the City Manager Office look into the potential of allocating funds from the Brinley Pool rehabilitation and Heers Park to the YUCCA Mountain project delegation. Additionally, to allocate a portion of these funds in the master planning of the 1200 acres of land in the northwest, the Tule Springs area and also the shooting range. CITY MANAGER VALENTINE explained the appropriate time to discuss this issue would be at the April 17, 2002 City Council meeting when an item about contributing money to the Nuclear Repository Fund would be discussed.

COUNCILMAN BROWN verified with MR. VINCENT that if a project, for whatever reason does not move forward, by policy the only way that project and or their dollars can change is by an action of the Council, either on an individual project or the list as a whole. He asked if it would be appropriate at this time to discuss those projects in need of funding. CITY MANAGER VALENTINE answered that by state law the City is required to present a tentative budget. Procedurally, the Council is not required to take any action at this time. MR. VINCENT added that the purpose of this discussion is to try to get as much direction from the Council for the final budget. There will be another mandatory budget hearing on the third Tuesday in May where the Council will approve the final budget. That which is not obtained, can always be brought back at another recessed meeting or another agenda item.

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF APRIL 15, 2002

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

MINUTES – Continued:

COUNCILMAN BROWN asked CITY ATTORNEY BRAD JERBIC that if project X is brought forward in the dialogue today, whether the Council could take action on that direction or does it become part of the dialogue. CITY ATTORNEY JERBIC replied that it has to be part of the dialogue because the item is not agendaed for any action, but it would be appropriate to bring up any issue that will eventually impact the final budget.

MR. McNELLIS explained that there was an additional request of \$500,000 for Deer Springs Regional Park. The Phase II design effort was advanced and staff came before the City Council and asked that the Phase I money be diverted over to Phase II. Therefore, as the awarding of the construction project for Phase I draws near, staff needs to replenish that funding.

MR. VINCENT continued with the list and indicated that Doolittle Community Center is fully funded and no additional funding is requested. The Firefighters Memorial Park funds are donations, and if those donations do not materialize, some other revenue source would be needed. He presented a list of Various Existing Park/Rec Facility Upgrades in need of approximately one million dollars in additional funding. Mostly are items that need repairs, refurbishment and replacement of various things. It was determined that these things need to be taken care of before problems get worse and have to spend additional money at a later time.

COUNCILMAN McDONALD pointed out that Gary Dexter Park was opened, but was not fully completed. There are still some open trenches and the landscape is not what it should be. MR. McNELLIS responded that the original funding for this park was to upgrade the bathrooms and bring the playground to ADA standards. MAYOR GOODMAN indicated that Gary Dexter Park does not appear on the list and asked where the money would come from to complete the park. MR. McNELLIS replied that Public Works and Field Operations would provide an estimate. CITY MANAGER VALENTINE suggested that since no allocations would be made at this time, it might be appropriate to take a look at the cost assessment and determine whether or not it is more cost effective to do that in-house or to contract out, and bring it back with the figures. But that would qualify as a new project and is not included in the Various Existing Park/Rec Facility Upgrade project category. She indicated that staff would like input from the Council on preferences for new projects, removing from the list or moving projects on and then come back with updated information.

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF APRIL 15, 2002

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

MINUTES – Continued:

COUNCILMAN McDONALD asked who is responsible for the maintenance of the fields in those cases where the City has an open doors/open school agreement with the School District. He asked that this information be provided at the next budget meeting.

MR. VINCENT resumed his outlining of projects fully funded. He indicated that the Downtown Community Center is the old Baptist Church located at Ninth and Bridger. The City Council approved and appropriated the money. The center would have to be renovated and if sold the City would have to either refund the CDBG money or allocate it to another appropriate project. COUNCILMAN BROWN asked why the facility is being brought up to standard if it is uncertain of what the end use would be. MR. McNELLIS answered that architectural staff has been looking at the existing condition of the building and bringing it up to a standard to allow public occupancy for assembly type situations. Once the building meets the building code requirement, tenants would be considered. MAYOR GOODMAN indicated that the Las Vegas Symphony has expressed interest in renting space, as well as the Las Vegas Performing Art High School, which would work in conjunction with the symphony. Several other non-profit groups involved in the arts are also looking to make this facility their home. Discussions are being held as to whether or not they can purchase it or whether or not they could lease. At the same time there are discussions with representatives of the Asian community as to how they can participate in the use of the facility as a community center.

MR. VINCENT presented a list of projects in need of funding totaling \$82,926,758. At this time only \$24,000,000 is available. The task is to allocate the \$24,000,000 to these projects. He outlined some of those projects. COUNCILWOMAN McDONALD pointed out that some projects on the list might not be completed by fiscal year 2003 and it is unlikely that that funding would be expanded in that fiscal year. Therefore, she suggested placing that funding in other areas. CITY MANAGER VALENTINE replied that she would follow up with the Public Works, Finance Department, and Neighborhood Services Departments as to whether there are external funding sources and would provide the Council with that information. It is possible that some projects, due to delays, could possibly be put into another fiscal year and move something else up the list. She will look into the phasing and the timelines for these projects.

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF APRIL 15, 2002

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

MINUTES – Continued:

COUNCILMAN BROWN indicated that he would prefer going through those projects that have some significance as far as immediate funding, next fiscal year or future funding. COUNCILMAN REESE stated that he would support taking money from the Arbor Hills Park and allocate it to another project and fund the park at the appropriate time. COUNCILMAN BROWN recommended that if a project is not going to be funded until next year or whenever appropriate, that \$1 be put beside that project making that a priority if a new project came along. COUNCILMAN WEEKLY stated that Council should follow the established policy that if monies are not being used for a specific project, the money goes into a fund to finish financing existing projects so they can be removed from the list. He opposes allocating the money to new projects.

MR. VINCENT stated that his understanding is that the Council's priorities are established based upon where the Council decides to appropriate the dollar. The Council can always bring back an agenda item at any time to make an adjustment or addition. MAYOR GOODMAN asked the Council members if they had a preference for prioritizing a park. COUNCILMAN REESE noted that the Council has always been supportive of each other's parks projects and does not feel that parks should be held back from being built by spending all the money only on one park.

COUNCILMAN BROWN indicated that some projects with a substantial dollar amount attached to them have not been on any formal list in the past. If these smaller upgrades or projects can be done under one agenda item on the major capital program, and if they reach a dollar amount that triggers, he suggested that the Council either vote to move it forward onto the overall list or it does not get funded. It is important that those projects on this priority list, as a group, remain in standing regardless of what comes in after the fact this year or next year. It is important that the next City Council understands the commitments and promises made by this City Council.

MR. McNELLIS stated that it is difficult for Finance and Public Works on how to divide the money. They try to look at the cash flow from when the money would actually be spent. But from Finance's perspective a project needs to be fully funded. It is difficult to accomplish only half of the park site. CITY MANAGER VALENTINE indicated that it would make the short list of projects more manageable to identify a threshold at which point that project competes on the CIP list with the other projects. Staff would be happy to bring back something for the Council at the next meeting.

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF APRIL 15, 2002

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

MINUTES – Continued:

COUNCILMAN BROWN addressed the Post Office Phase I and II and asked what can realistically be done in the next 12 months. The Council should focus on what is doable and when a realistic number is reached, then this Council can adopt as far as a capital program is concerned. CITY MANAGER VALENTINE remarked that the capital improvement program requires that a five-year plan be submitted, and when a project is deferred or does not rise up the list, it gets moved to a future fiscal year. COUNCILMAN BROWN stated that the entire Council wants this project, but would like to look at it realistically. MAYOR GOODMAN explained that the City would probably get title to the Post Office within the next 30 days and then plan as to what projects will go in there. After the Council agrees that that is an appropriate project, consultants will advise the City on how to accomplish that. COUNCILMAN BROWN stated that he does not believe that the 5.5 million dollars will be available to be spent for next fiscal year, and asked staff to bring back a percentage of that 5.5. MR. VINCENT explained that the contract has to be fully funded, even though all the monies might not be expended in that contract in the first year. The Post Office Building Renovation and the Post Office Park Phase I, Public Works did estimate that those two phases would in fact be committed in fiscal year 2003. Therefore, based on the recommendation from Public Works, two million dollars would be needed to cover those two items. Phase II is not scheduled to happen until 2004. He recommended that the Council defer the 3.3 million dollars for the Post Office Park Phase II to a future year.

COUNCILMAN McDONALD asked if the Post Office renovation could fall under the Capital Projects rather than park projects. MR. McNELLIS explained that the Post Office Building Renovation and the Post Office Park are two different projects. MR. VINCENT further explained that the building renovation is competing for the same discretionary money. The list of projects in need of funding is not just a list of parks and recreation projects, but also City facilities. Additionally, a \$170,000 grant is anticipated toward the renovation of the Post Office.

While addressing the Alexander Hualapai Park project, COUNCILMAN BROWN asked if staff could provide a breakdown into smaller phases. MAYOR GOODMAN commented that it would seem that this would create a prioritization in trying to figure out where the money is going to come from for future years on these projects. COUNCILMAN BROWN pointed out that in the past major projects have been broken into phases in order to build some equity throughout, instead of putting projects on hold. CITY MANAGER VALENTINE explained that phasing would be an entirely separate bid package and the money has to be encumbered within that fiscal year. It does not matter when it is expended. The total project might be \$20 million, but it might be built in three seven million dollar segments.

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF APRIL 15, 2002

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

MINUTES – Continued:

COUNCILMAN REESE explained that originally the Bonanza Sandhill Ballfields was set aside for one 90-foot baseball field. However, a location was found where there would be two 60-foot baseball fields, along with a soccer field and all the amenities that come with these fields. MR. VINCENT suggested that \$700,000 could possibly be taken off the Arbor Hills project and allocated to the Bonanza Sandhill Ballfields to make this project complete. When a site is found for the Arbor Hills, there will be a real dollar estimate attached to it and be brought back to Council for appropriation. COUNCILMAN REESE supported MR. VINCENT'S recommendation.

It was decided to fund \$6.1 million dollars for the reconstruction of Fountain Park. This would be the sum of money to be extended for the next fiscal year. COUNCILMAN WEEKLY noted that he is very excited about this park. It is being used year-round for all type of sports, as well as a possible BMX playground.

Huntridge Circle Park Renovation has never been on the priority list. MR. VINCENT indicated that Public Works requested \$600,000 to be committed for next year to cover design engineering, construction, equipment and furnishings. COUNCILMAN REESE noted that he has had neighborhood meetings and discussed this park with the neighbors, who have expressed a desire to use the park for picnics and asked that it have similar amenities found in other parks throughout the City. He has been working closely with COMMISSIONER MYRNA WILLIAMS, as far as obtaining funding for this park.

Addressing the Mirabelli Park, MR. McNELLIS explained that since the senior center building is already funded and the vacation of Hargrove Avenue was already approved, there are some site considerations that need to be done in conjunction with the senior center itself. There is a two-year split over the site improvements. The first year the site improvements relate to the senior building and the upcoming years relate to the leisure building. COUNCILMAN McDONALD added that a tentative groundbreaking is scheduled for September and the development will commence after Metro vacates their building. MR. VINCENT suggested allocating \$600,000 as a space-holder. Since the construction of the Mirabelli Community Center Remodel is not anticipated to begin before 2005 and no funding was requested for Fiscal Year 2003, he suggested that a \$1 marker be placed. Likewise for the Mountain Ridge Phase IV, the Police Memorial Park Phase II projects and the Reed Whipple Cultural Center projects.

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF APRIL 15, 2002

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

MINUTES – Continued:

COUNCILMAN BROWN asked if the Post Office Park Phase I would fall into the master plan for the entire area, which includes the proposed arena and the relocation of the Downtown Transportation Center. MAYOR GOODMAN answered that it is impossible to plan the park until the Downtown Transportation Center is moved. MR. McNELLIS explained that Phase I would remove the asphalt between the Post Office Building and City Hall and install green space into the current parking lot. COUNCILMAN BROWN was concerned that once the park is built, it might have to be removed for further City Hall expansions. He recommended placing \$1 marker next to Post Office Park Phase I. DEPUTY CITY MANAGER BETSY FRETWELL indicated that at the April 17, 2002 City Council meeting, a presentation would be made outlining all the various steps over the years, the transition from Federal to City of Las Vegas ownership, occupancy of the building, as well as the potential park. This presentation might address some of those issues raised by COUNCILMAN BROWN, as far as phasing out DTC and the tenants in the Post Office building. By putting a place marker, staff might be able to come back with a more accurate number for year one, for both the park and the building and get further direction after the meeting on Wednesday. MAYOR GOODMAN suggested placing a question mark instead, until that presentation. MR. VINCENT reiterated that the asterisk under the CDBG column represents possible funding for the Post Office Park Phase I.

DEPUTY CITY MANAGER FRETWELL noted that the Robison Community School Modular was funded in the CDBG process last week and no longer needs to remain on the list of projects in need of funding.

MR. VINCENT indicated that the City plans to replace the existing Stupak Community Center. No money is being asked for Fiscal Year 2003. This project is new to the list, but there have been discussions about it. COUNCILMAN McDONALD asked that \$1 marker be placed next to it. However, COUNCILMAN BROWN commented that it should have a separate designation because it is a new project, and could be placed on a future list of new projects.

COUNCILWOMAN McDONALD indicated that the City Council already approved \$2,050,000 for the Veterans Memorial Pool Cover. She is concerned about the potential of operating a year-round covered facility versus opening this pool as an open-air seasonal facility currently planned to be opened within the month. She recommended that this pool remain initially a seasonal pool to give the City an opportunity to analyze the current operation, projected staff and maintenance costs over the course of a few years.

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF APRIL 15, 2002

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

MINUTES – Continued:

COUNCILWOMAN McDONALD recommended that the matter be handled at a future date because the numbers to date would make that imprudent. An agreement has been reached with the School District regarding the pool cover. MAYOR GOODMAN confirmed with MR. VINCENT that the \$1.3 million would be identified from other sources. MR. VINCENT verified that the \$2,050,000 would be temporarily placed into the reserve fund. In correcting the worksheet, the new figure would include that amount. COUNCILWOMAN McDONALD directed that the person in contact with the School District focus discussions on the operation rather than capital aspect of the facility.

MR. VINCENT introduced Phase I of the Washington Buffalo Master Plan, which includes design, and construction of a tennis complex on land adjacent to the Summerlin Parkway. The design/engineering has been estimated at \$1 million, construction at \$1.95 million and furniture/furnishings/equipment (FF&E) at \$400,000. The total is projected at \$10.9 with allocated funding of \$2.8 million. There is an additional request for \$7.7 million in 2003. Furniture/furnishings would be pushed out to Fiscal Year 2005. COUNCILWOMAN McDONALD confirmed with MR. McNELLIS that any Phase II work in this budget cycle would be limited at the very outside to design work. Therefore, any related budget allocations should be shifted. MR. VINCENT advised that the \$7.7 million request is for Phase I and FF&E would need to be funded in 2004. COUNCILWOMAN McDONALD announced with the permission of the Darling Foundation that they will contribute \$1 million to this phase of the park project, \$750,000 for capital costs and \$250,000 over five years for operation of the facility. A formal announcement will be made at the May 1, 2002 Council meeting. MR. VINCENT made a correction to reflect the Darling donation, thereby reducing the funding request.

COUNCILWOMAN McDONALD requested recommendation from MR. VINCENT and MR. McNELLIS as to funds available for Phase II. MR. McNELLIS replied that staff would follow the direction of Council, but had anticipated at least design work on Phase II. COUNCILWOMAN McDONALD stated that her priority is Phase I, and she would understand if Phase II had to be deferred, although it might not be her preference.

MR. VINCENT pointed out that the first pass through the budget leaves \$4.4 million in unrestricted funding as well as allocation of the residential construction tax. It is possible that there are neighborhood components in these parks for which that money could be utilized. There has been discussion of phasing the Alexander Hualapai Park, assuming that there was a neighborhood component for that park.

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF APRIL 15, 2002

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

MINUTES – Continued:

COUNCILMAN McDONALD requested a breakdown by Ward. MR. VINCENT responded by displaying such a list which also incorporated the best conservative estimate of carry out and new revenue funds. COUNCILMAN MACK confirmed with MR. VINCENT that the full funding of Parsons Park and \$900,000 for Deer Springs Park was not part of the \$1.9 million collected.

Ultimately, the list showed allocated funds in red for those projects to be funded Fiscal Year 2003, \$1 next to those projects that would be funded in future years, and NP for new projects. The complete spreadsheet list was submitted for the record.

COUNCILMAN McDONALD excused himself from the meeting to attend a Housing Authority meeting.

MR. VINCENT thanked the Council for the positive start and guidance so that staff can complete the budget and present it at the budget hearing in May.

COUNCILMAN BROWN commented that the projects listed on the screen, which did not appear on the previously adopted list be identified as new projects. MR. VINCENT suggested adding an “N” in the margin to so identify new projects. In fairness, the Mirabelli Center was funded but not the Mirabelli Park. For clarification, it would appear the park is a new item. MS. FALDER reminded MR. VINCENT that the funds represented carry over dollars and the project was once funded. The Huntridge, Harmony, Mirabelli Park, Reed Whipple, Stupak and Robinson Community School are new projects since the list was adopted in December. COUNCILMAN BROWN directed that those items be brought back to Council to be added to the adopted list. Similarly, the Post Office, Bonanza Sandhill (previously identified as the baseball field) and Washington Buffalo Phase II should come before Council for inclusion on the adopted list. COUNCILWOMAN McDONALD noted that the Washington Buffalo project will be a 150-acre project and cannot possibly be constructed in less than five or six phases.

MR. VINCENT assured COUNCILMAN BROWN that the two lists would be reconciled as either an independent action item or during the budget hearing. COUNCILMAN REESE instructed that the matter be resolved as soon as possible.

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF APRIL 15, 2002

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

MINUTES – Continued:

COUNCILMAN BROWN questioned his colleagues as to any possible projects, which may be pending and require funding. MAYOR GOODMAN responded that his only question would be with regard to the Fifth Street School. MR. VINCENT answered that the budget includes \$3.5 million for construction of the new downtown area command, but the only funding available for the Fifth Street School itself is in the budget for the Office of Business Development (OBD). CITY MANAGER VALENTINE pointed out that as a Redevelopment Agency project, it would be more appropriate to fund through the OBD budget.

CITY MANAGER VALENTINE requested direction from the Council as to whether or not the Council would like another budget workshop prior to the final budget hearing. COUNCILMAN REESE indicated that it would depend on whether funding was available for the various upgrades as well as new projects. MR. VINCENT replied that staff would present a procedural policy on the handling of upgrades on a threshold basis. Below that threshold, the Council may want to leave it at the discretion of staff. COUNCILMAN REESE expressed a concern with Circle Park being identified as a new project or as a rehab item. MR. VINCENT identified the project as a new project.

CITY MANAGER VALENTINE suggested that the issue might be whether to differentiate based on new project versus rehab or based on the size of the project. Many rehabilitation projects are so large they are included in the capital improvement list. MR. VINCENT stated that staff has internally used a threshold of \$250,000 to determine the assignment of projects. Staff would like some discretion in order to act in a timely manner based on need. Above that discretionary threshold, the item will be brought before Council. Circle Park would be on the capital improvements list because it is over \$250,000.

COUNCILMAN BROWN commented that the projects on the list range from \$25,000 to \$554,000. MR. VINCENT answered that those funds are allocated and merely carrying over. COUNCILMAN BROWN made a record for COUNCILMAN McDONALD that there is dialogue between his staff and the Bennett YMCA to acquire an aquatic center, which should be introduced as a new project.

COUNCILMAN BROWN directed that he would like to review the original planned augmentation for the parks CIP as well as the City facilities CIP. Prior to the approval of the \$2 million funding for the West Satellite Building he would need to see the facility master plan. It

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF APRIL 15, 2002

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

MINUTES – Continued:

would appear that this building is more important than some of the parks on the list. The entire Council should be briefed on that component. Likewise, the general facility projects need to be broken out to give the Council members a sense of those priorities. The City is trying to build up the building reserve and he would like an idea as to the balance, projected balance and proposed uses. The downtown area command is essential, but should be included in the briefings so that the Council could determine whether or not there are other priorities for that funding.

COUNCILMAN BROWN instructed that the issue involving funding of eligible projects via CDBG funding be revisited. The City needs to be more selfish in using those federal dollars. It is important that the Council answer as to its budget policies. Staff is seeking a 12% ending fund balance, which is a substantial change to the 10% policy. That 2% has been used to fund capital improvement projects. Staff alleged that this is consistent with other communities. He would like to see a report as to which communities and the type of communities. It has been the policy of Council to use one-time dollars or augmentation dollars for the capital improvement plan, fire safety and/or public safety. In addition, funding projection is done on a very conservative basis. Before he can support increasing the ending balance to 12%, he will need to understand the purpose. His concern would be that the City would be sitting on funds that could be better used to meet today's needs. Preserving fiscal integrity must be weighed against meeting pressing needs.

MR. VINCENT assured the Council that there will be additional briefings on the \$1.5 million allocated for repairs and refurbishment.

MAYOR GOODMAN discussed with CITY MANAGER VALENTINE whether Council should recess with the intent of holding one more hearing or several. MAYOR GOODMAN recommended that the matter be resolved in one more hearing inasmuch as the lengthy hearing portion took place during this meeting. CITY MANAGER VALENTINE responded that the follow-up presentation would take place at the May 1, 2002 Council meeting. COUNCILMAN BROWN indicated that he was not comfortable with that since the final numbers are still at issue. Since there is still work to be done and the next discussion will probably still be lengthy, he would support a separate meeting. CITY MANAGER VALENTINE advised that the agenda today did not allow for action, but staff would act based on that direction.

(8:39 – 12:06)

1-1/2-1

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE**SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS CITY COUNCIL AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY****MEETING OF: APRIL 15, 2002**

DEPARTMENT: FINANCE AND BUSINESS SERVICES**DIRECTOR: MARK R. VINCENT**☐**CONSENT**☒**DISCUSSION****SUBJECT:**

Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Redevelopment Agency Tentative Budget

Fiscal Impact☒**No Impact****Amount:**☐**Budget Funds Available****Dept./Division:** Budget & Finance Division☐**Augmentation Required****Funding Source:****PURPOSE/BACKGROUND:**

Review and discussion of FY2003 City of Las Vegas Redevelopment Agency Tentative Budget as filed with the Nevada Department of Taxation on April 12, 2002.

RECOMMENDATION:

No Action Required

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

FY2003 City of Las Vegas Redevelopment Tentative Budget

MINUTES:

MAYOR GOODMAN called the Redevelopment Agency Tentative Budget. MR. VINCENT explained that the Equalization Board has made significant adjustments as to the hotel/casino properties. The City is fortunate in that some new assets came on during the year and the value of those has exceeded the reductions made by the Equalization Board. The revenues from the tax increment in the Redevelopment Agency are sufficient to make the debt service and cover the small operating costs, which still exist. There is little to report beyond that, but staff will be happy to provide additional information or briefings prior to the final budget hearing.

COUNCILMAN BROWN stated that the entire process has been very impressive. The information and statements regarding what has happened since 1997 as far as bond rating increases, budget policies adopted, fire initiative that passed and the millions of dollars saved are truly amazing. This is especially true given the situations being experienced by other communities across the country. Unfortunately good news does not get the press, but the City of Las Vegas taxpayers' rate has been almost frozen for five years through efficiencies and now

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF APRIL 15, 2002

Item 2 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Redevelopment Agency Tentative Budget

MINUTES – Continued:

they may even see a reduction. This is a testimonial to City staff and they should be publicly acknowledged. MAYOR GOODMAN agreed that the entire Council concurs with those comments.

(12:06 – 12:09)

3-906



AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE
SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS CITY COUNCIL AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
MEETING OF: APRIL 15, 2002

CITIZENS PARTICIPATION:

Items raised under this portion of the Agenda cannot be deliberated or acted upon until the notice provisions of the Open Meeting Law have been met. If you wish to speak on a matter not listed on the agenda, please step up to the podium and clearly state your name and address. In consideration of others, avoid repetition, and limit your comments to no more than three (3) minutes. To ensure all persons equal opportunity to speak, each subject matter will be limited to ten (10) minutes.

MINUTES:

AL GALLEG0, citizen of Las Vegas, brought to the Council's attention the very dangerous situation that existed April 16, 2002 due to the criminal activity of a man living in the neighborhood. He would like a meeting with MAYOR GOODMAN and COUNCILMAN WEEKLY to discuss the situation.

(12:09 – 12:10)

3-1028

TOM McGOWAN, Las Vegas resident, advised that the meeting is in violation of the Nevada Open Meeting Law. The City Council and Redevelopment agency are distinct entities and require individual meetings, agendas and citizens participation portions. This is an expedient process, which violates the law, and any action is nullified by that violation. That nullification made the meetings a waste of time. Just as individuals must abide by the law, the Council must abide by it. His comments have been submitted for the record.

(12:10 – 12:13)

3-1066

TOMMY RICKETTS, citizen of Ward 6 and President of the Classified Employees Association (CEA), stated that he is proud to be a native Las Vegas and City employee. He outlined a concern that some efficiencies have disempowered employees, who do not have input. That input could be utilized in the facts and figures in the budget. There must be a balance and accountability. There is also a concern with paying the power bill for the YMCA at the Northwest Leisure Service Center and other things such as future staffing of the East Las Vegas Community Center. Lastly, it would seem that no one should get hired during a hiring freeze. The City supposedly has such a freeze, but there is hiring going on subject to justification. A reduction in service does not always justify the cost savings.

(12:13 – 12:16)

3-1153

City of Las Vegas

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF APRIL 15,
2002

Citizen Participation

MINUTES – Continued:

DEAN FLETCHER, President of the Firefighters Union and City resident, expressed regret that the status of Stations 5, 6 and 8 had not been moved forward with rehabilitation. These stations are in excess of 40 years old. Additional bays and rescue units are necessary to expand service into the older area of town, which are not possible at those stations. The stations require a lot of maintenance. Unfortunately none of those appear in the budget to date. He suggested that each station be addressed over the next three fiscal years on a priority basis.

(12:16 – 12:18)

3-1275

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 12:18 P.M.

Respectfully submitted: _____

ANGELA CROLLI

March 24, 2004